

Even a small 5 percent reduction in the regulatory budget, about \$2.8 billion, is estimated to result in about \$75 billion in expanded private sector GDP each year with an increase in employment by 1.2 million jobs annually. On average, eliminating the job of a single regulator grows the American economy by \$6.2 million and nearly 100 private sector jobs annually. Conversely, each million-dollar increase in the regulatory budget costs the economy 420 private sector jobs.

This is a study that shows conclusively that we're right when we say that the REINS Act will help to create jobs in this country and the current regulatory morass that we're facing in this country is costing American jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 2100

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### NATURAL GAS ECONOMIC IMPACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the positive economic impact on jobs of shale gas production that was documented during a recent hearing in Pennsylvania by the bipartisan Natural Gas Caucus, which I cochair.

An additional area of economic impact of the natural gas production is the direct benefits to Pennsylvania. From 2008 to 2010, Pennsylvania established three leases for natural gas production on State forest lands. These leases have generated signing bonuses totaling \$413 million and earned the State another \$100 million in royalties.

Since 2007, a total of \$1.7 billion in corporate taxes have also been paid. During 2012 and 2013, the natural gas

industry contributed \$406 million in impact fees that are benefiting counties and communities across Pennsylvania.

By 2035, shale gas will contribute \$42.4 billion annually to Pennsylvania's economy, up from the \$7.1 billion in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the economic impact from natural gas development in Pennsylvania is exceeding all expectations. Governor Corbett and the Pennsylvania State legislature are to be congratulated for their leadership in shale gas production.

#### HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little time tonight with my colleague, Representative YOUNG from Indiana, to talk a little bit about health care in America, talk a little bit about the Affordable Care Act that is currently being implemented, and talk about the need for real health care reform in this country.

I want to start out by just emphasizing that I firmly believe we need health care reform. I believe that the health care reform we got in the form of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, is not the health care reform that we need. And I would say that we have lots of proposals here in the House. I think last Congress we had over 200 bills introduced that related to the health care system, reforming our health care system. And this Congress, we have dozens of health care reform related bills as well.

So the idea that it's either the Affordable Care Act as we're seeing it unfold, or nothing at all, it's a false choice. That's not the choice that we have. There are lots of ideas; lots of much better ideas, I must add. And while I am personally for repeal—I certainly want the Affordable Care Act repealed—I want to replace it with quality, patient-centered health care reform.

I am not against providing relief to Americans who are feeling the burden of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare right now. In fact, we had a hearing on the implementation of the ObamaCare law in the Ways and Means Committee today, a committee of which I am a member. And my colleague Representative YOUNG is also a member. And we heard a lot of people say hey, this is the law of the land, don't mess with it. This is the law of the land, let it go. This is the law of the land, any attempt to criticize it, to discuss its shortcomings, is a waste of time.

Well, I reject that outright. And, you know, I think the President, through his actions, has rejected that.

What am I talking about? Well, it's interesting because we've passed seven

bills in this House, seven bills, that relate to ObamaCare, changing ObamaCare, repealing a part of ObamaCare, seven that not only passed this House, we sent them to the other side of the Capitol. They passed the Senate. And you know what? The President signed them into law. That may come as a surprise to some folks, but it's the truth. We passed seven bills to change, to modify, to repeal parts of, to make better ObamaCare, and the President has agreed with us on all seven. He signed them into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Are these some of the very same bills, my good colleague, that the President in recent speeches has characterized as partisan, misguided, meaningless? I do believe you may be referring to some of those bills.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Those are the same bills, and I would like to go through, if I can, the seven bills, and talk a little bit about what they do and how they were an improvement. I think they are evidence that yes, we'd like to replace this bill with something much better, this law, but in the short term, we will do whatever it takes to provide relief to American workers, relief to American families, relief to small businesses that are under the burden of ObamaCare.

So let me mention a few of these.

H.R. 4: H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork 1099 mandate. I remember when I first got to Congress, I heard from a bunch of folks about the 1099 filing obligation under the President's health care law. We repealed that. You know what the President did? He agreed. Bad part of the law.

Next, H.R. 1473. We cut \$2.2 billion from what was characterized as a stealth public plan, a consumer-operated and -oriented plan, and froze the IRS budget. The President signed that into law.

Next, H.R. 674. We saved taxpayers \$13 billion by adjusting the eligibility for ObamaCare programs. The President signed that into law.

H.R. 2055 made more reductions to the consumer-operated and -oriented plan that I mentioned earlier, also to the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, an independent board that's going to cut Medicare, because it hasn't been reformed, when it runs out of money. So that was signed into law. And again in today's hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, folks on the other side of the aisle were saying this talk, this criticism about the President's law, ObamaCare, a waste of time, meaningless, all politics. Hogwash; the President signed a bunch of it into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, it is hogwash. And it's particularly hogwash because among those various reforms that you've itemized there, let's reflect on how much persuasion, how much public argument was required to even bring the President of the United States to go along with repealing this egregious, superfluous 1099 obligation.